1 J Christopher Jorgensen, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 5382 2 Matthew R. Tsai, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14290 3 LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600 4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Tel: (702) 949-8200 5 Email: cjorgensen@lewisroca.com Email: mtsai@lewisroca.com 6 Attorney for Defendant Hyundai Capital America 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 9 10 JAJUAN KARLAN JACKSON. Case No. 2:20-cv-02295-APG-DJA 11 Plaintiff. **JOINT STIPULATION FOR** 12 **EXTENSION OF TIME FOR** VS. DEFENDANT TO FILE RESPONSIVE HYUNDAI CAPITAL AMERICA, INC., 13 **PLEADING** a Foreign Corporation, 14 (SECOND REQUEST) Defendant. 15 16 17 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) and LR IA 6-1, Defendant 18 Hyundai Capital America ("HCA") and Plaintiff Jajuan Karlan Jackson ("Plaintiff") (collectively, 19 "parties"), through their respective attorneys, respectfully request that the Court extend the 20 deadline in which HCA has to answer or otherwise plead to Plaintiff's Complaint. 21 **STIPULATION** 22 1. Whereas, Plaintiff's Waiver of Service of the Summons was filed on February 1, 23 2021 (ECF No. 1): 24 2. Whereas, after executing a waiver of service, HCA's deadline to respond to the 25 Plaintiff's Complaint was April 19, 2021; 26 3. Whereas, HCA filed an unopposed motion to extend its deadline to respond to 27 Plaintiff's Complaint, seeking an extension by 21 days through and including May 10, 2021 28 ("First Request") (ECF No. 5);

- 4. **Whereas**, this Court granted HCA's First Request to extend its deadline to respond through and until May 10, 2021 (ECF No. 7);
  - 5. **Whereas**, the parties are engaged in negotiating a settlement in this matter;
- 6. **Whereas**, a further stipulation to extend time for HCA to respond to the Complaint was inadvertently not filed in a timely manner on or before May 10, 2021;
- Whereas, the parties hereby stipulate that there is good cause that the stipulation be accepted by the court, specifically, that (1) the delay in filing an answer was the result of excusable neglect based on an intent to settle the matter before a response to the Complaint is necessary, and is not the result of willful conduct or gross neglect on the part of HCA, (2) the Plaintiff and, respectfully, the Court will not be prejudiced by the delay, and (3) the parties are engaged in negotiating settlement and are hopeful that that matter will be resolves prior to HCA incurring further legal expenses on filing a responsive pleading, which instead can be diverted to settlement efforts.

///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

///

17 | ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 | ///

- 3 -